

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-40 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 16, 20, 36, and 40 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 16 and 36 are objected to. Claims 1, 20, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-14, 16, 20-34, 36, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,938,022) (“Singhal”). Claims 15 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal and further in view of Benjamin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,572) (“Benjamin”). Claims 17-19 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal.

**Objection to Claims 16 and 36**

Claims 16 and 36 are object to because of the following informalities: “HTTPS” must be spelled out. Accordingly, claims 16 and 36 have been amended to spell out “HTTPS.” Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 16 and 36.

**Rejection of Claims 1, 20, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1, 20, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the term “has not established a relationship” in the claims is a relative term that renders the claim indefinite. Accordingly, claims 1, 20, and 40 have been amended to recite that the “first party is not authenticated or registered” rather than the “first party has not established a relationship.” Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 20, and 40.

**Rejection of Claims 1-14, 16, 20-34, 36, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-14, 16, 20-34, 36, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,938,022) (“Singhal”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Singhal fails to disclose each and every element of the claims.

Singhal does not disclose “sending a notification to the first party, wherein the notification provides information for securely accessing the response,” as recited in claims 1, 20, and 40. In other words, the claims recite that the first party receives a notification that contains information to instruct the first party how to securely view the response. For example, the originally-filed specification recites:

A notification email is sent (e.g., Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) to the user to securely retrieve the reply without any additional information. The notification, for example, takes the form of providing the user with a hyperlink of a Uniform Resource Locator in the notification email and an authentication screen is displayed whereby the user is asked for his/her identification and a password. Once authenticated, the secure reply is presented to the user.

Page 4, lines 2-8. Thus, as required by claims 1, 20, and 40, the notification provides information (e.g., a URL) for securely accessing (e.g., using an identification and password) the response.

In contrast, Singhal fails to disclose such a notification. Instead, Singhal sends a response directly to the customer. “The service merchant 22 responds with service results in the form of quote or query to the customer via merchant/customer identifier.” Col. 18, lines 31-33; see also col. 18, lines 54-57 (“The service merchant 22 responds with service results in the form of delivery of the custom tailor item to the customer via merchant/customer identifier.”) Singhal does not recite requiring a password to access the response. And Singhal does not recite providing a URL to the customer to access the response. In fact, Singhal sends the second party’s response to the customer in an e-mail or even using the post office or express mail:

The Information system 12 receives the service results and forwards the service results to the customer 20. More specifically, the information system 12 uses the sequence number 330 to retrieve the electronic mail address of the customer 20. After retrieving the electronic mail address, the results are forwarded to the customer 20 via the customer interface 20A using the electronic mail address of the customer 20. Alternatively the results may be forwarded to the customer 20 using other ways, such mail using the post office or express mail.

Col. 16, lines 58-67. Thus, Singhal fails to disclose “sending a notification to the first party, wherein the notification provides information for securely accessing the response,” as recited in claims 1, 20, and 40.

Therefore, Singhal fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1, 20, and 40. Because claims 1, 20, and 40 are believed to be allowable, claims 2-14, 16, 21-34, and 36 are also believed to be allowable as they depend on claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-14, 16, 20-34, 36, and 40.

**Rejection of Claims 15 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 15 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal and further in view of Benjamin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,572) (“Benjamin”). For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 20, Singhal and Benjamin do not establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 1, 20, and 40 because Singhal fails to disclose each and every element of the independent claims. Benjamin fails to cure the deficiencies of Singhal. Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 15 and 35.

**Rejection of Claims 17-19 and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 17-19 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 20, Singhal does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 17-19 and 37-39 because Singhal fails to disclose each and every element of the independent claims. Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 17-19 and 37-39.

**CONCLUSION**

The undersigned representative respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with the undersigned representative, in person or over the telephone, we welcome the opportunity to do so. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filling of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account 110980.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 19, 2007  
KING & SPALDING LLP  
1700 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 626-8980

By: /Eric L. Sophir, Reg. #48,499/  
Eric L. Sophir  
Registration No. 48,499